

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA**  
**SHREVEPORT DIVISION**

**AARON M. VANCE**

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 10-394-P**

**VERSUS**

**JUDGE STAGG**

**STATE OF LOUISIANA**

**MAGISTRATE JUDGE HORNSBY**

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

In accordance with the standing order of this Court, this matter was referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge for review, report and recommendation.

**STATEMENT OF CLAIM**

Before the Court is a civil action filed in forma pauperis by pro se plaintiff Aaron M. Vance ("Vance"), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1361. This complaint was received and filed in this Court on March 2, 2010. Vance is incarcerated at the David Wade Correctional Center in Homer, Louisiana. He names the State of Louisiana as defendant.

Vance seeks a writ of mandamus to direct the State of Louisiana to provide him with discovery documents. Mandamus relief is available "to compel an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof to perform a duty owed to the plaintiff." 28 U.S.C. § 1361. However, it is well settled that federal courts have no general power to compel action by state officials. See Davis v. Lansing, 851 F.2d 72, 74 (2d Cir. 1988); Van Sickle v. Holloway, 791 F.2d 1431, 1436 n.5 (10th Cir. 1986); Russell v. Knight, 488 F.2d 96, 97 (5th Cir. 1973); Haggard v. State of Tennessee, 421 F. 2d 1384, 1386 (6th Cir. 1970). Because

Defendant is not federal officer, employee or agency, this Court lacks jurisdiction to issue a writ of mandamus to compel it to perform an alleged duty. See 28 U.S.C. § 1361.

Accordingly,

**IT IS RECOMMENDED** that Plaintiff's action be **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** for lack of jurisdiction.

### **OBJECTIONS**

Under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), parties aggrieved by this recommendation have fourteen (14) days from service of this Report and Recommendation to file specific, written objections with the Clerk of Court, unless an extension of time is granted under Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b). A party may respond to another party's objections within ten (10) days after being served with a copy thereof. Counsel are directed to furnish a courtesy copy of any objections or responses to the District Judge at the time of filing.

A party's failure to file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation set forth above, within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy shall bar that party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal the proposed factual findings and legal conclusions that were accepted by the district court and to which the aforementioned party did not object. See Douglas v. U.S.A.A., 79 F.3d 1415 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

**THUS DONE AND SIGNED**, in chambers, in Shreveport, Louisiana, this 18<sup>th</sup> day  
of October, 2010.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
MARK L. HORNSBY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE